



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/804,918	03/19/2004	Thomas G. Hallin	CE10557W	8360
23330	7590	11/02/2005		
MOTOROLA, INC. LAW DEPARTMENT 1303 E. ALGONQUIN ROAD SCHAUMBURG, IL 60196			EXAMINER NGUYEN, QUANG N	
			ART UNIT 2141	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/804,918	Applicant(s) HALLIN, THOMAS G.	
	Examiner Quang N. Nguyen	Art Unit 2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 March 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Detailed Action

1. This Office Action is in response to the Application SN 10/804,918 filed on 03/19/2004. Claims 1-25 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. **Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Karusawa (US 2004/0053573 A1).**

4. As to claim 1, Karusawa teaches a method for registering multiple communications devices, comprising:

identifying a communication device for registration by a user for providing an identified communication device (*identifying device A, B, or C as illustrated in Fig. 3*);

setting a priority for the identified communication device (*priority 1, 2 or 3*); and

storing the identified communication device and the priority corresponding to the identified communication device in the database (*storing the identified devices A, B and C and their corresponding priority*) (Karusawa, Fig. 3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karusawa, in view of Thubert et al. (US 2004/0098507 A1), hereafter referred as Thubert.

7. As to claim 1, Karusawa teaches the method of claim 1, but does not explicitly teach receiving and storing the IP address in an entry in the database corresponding to the identified communication device.

In a related art, Thubert teaches a method and system for mobile IP registration using a Mobile Binding Table 800, which includes a plurality of entries 801, associated with the IP address of the identified communication device (Thubert, Fig. 8 and paragraph [0056]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Karusawa and Thubert to include receiving and storing the IP address in an entry in the database corresponding to the identified communication device since such methods were conventionally employed in the art to allow the system (*i.e., the Home Agent*) to register the Mobile Nodes of the user to enable messages to be routed to any device that an individual choose to use at a given point in time (*i.e., based on the pre-set priority*) (Thubert, paragraph [0035]).

8. Claims 3-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karusawa-Thubert, and further in view of Matsuzaki et al. (US 2004/0162870 A1), hereafter referred as Matsuzaki.

9. As to claim 3, Karusawa-Thubert teaches the method of claim 2, but does not explicitly teach setting a registration time of the identified communication device and storing the registration time in an entry in the database corresponding to the identified communication device.

In a related art, Matsuzaki teaches a method and system for registering client devices, wherein the registered device list (*i.e., table/database*) as illustrated in Fig. 4 comprises the registered communication device CLIENT ID, REGISTRATION DATE-TIME at which the client device identified by the CLIENT ID is registered with the server, etc. (Matsuzaki, Fig. 4 and paragraphs [0063-0064] and [0067]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Karusawa-Thubert and Matsuzaki to include setting a registration time of the identified communication device and storing the registration time in an entry in the database corresponding to the identified communication device since such methods were conventionally employed in the art to allow the system to register both the CLIENT ID to identify the user devices and the REGISTRATION DATE-TIME to keep track of the date and time at which the client device is registered with the system (Matsuzaki, paragraphs [0064] and [0067]).

10. As to claim 4, Karusawa-Thubert-Matsuzaki teaches the method of claim 3, further including selecting an expiration registration time corresponding to the identified communication device and based upon a type of identified communication device (*when registering the client device 200, the server 100 may generate expiry information showing a time period during which the registration with the server 100 remains valid*); and storing the expiration registration time in an entry of the database corresponding to the identified communication device (*storing the expiration registration time as WITHDRAWAL DATE-TIME field as illustrated in Fig. 4*) (Matsuzaki, paragraph [0303]).

11. As to claim 5, Karusawa-Thubert-Matsuzaki teaches the method of claim 4, further including a step of determining by the communication system whether the identified communication is currently registered (Matsuzaki, paragraph [0298]).

12. As to claim 6, Karusawa-Thubert-Matsuzaki teaches the method of claim 5, further including steps of changing the IP address for the currently registered identified communication device; and storing the changed IP address in the entry of the identified communication device in the database (*storing the changed IP address in the Mobility Binding Table as illustrated in Fig. 8 of Thubert*) (Thubert, Fig. 8).

13. As to claims 7-8, Karusawa-Thubert-Matsuzaki teaches the method of claim 5, further including the steps of selecting a registration time by the communication system for the database corresponding to the identified communication device and selecting an expiration registration time based upon a type of identified communication device (*since the client device is registered only for a time period shown by the expiry information, the server monitors passage of time and the registration is automatically canceled at the expiry of the time period*) (Matsuzaki, paragraph [0303] and [0305]).

14. As to claims 9-10, Karusawa-Thubert-Matsuzaki teaches the method of claim 8, further including a step of selecting the expiration registration time for a first type of identified communication device such as a computer to be a first value approximately 1 hour (*when registering the client device 200, the server 100 may generate expiry information showing a time period during which the registration with the server 100 remains valid, wherein the expiration registration time could be set at 1 hour for a computer as implemented by the server/administrator*) (Matsuzaki, paragraph [0303]).

15. Claims 11-12 are corresponding method claims of method claims 9-10; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

16. As to claim 13, Karusawa-Thubert-Matsuzaki teaches the method of claim 11, further including selecting the priority of the identified communication device based upon the type of the identified communication device (Karusawa, paragraph [0111]).

17. As to claim 14, Karusawa-Thubert-Matsuzaki teaches the method of claim 13, further including the steps of selecting a first priority based upon a location of a mobile station or based on manual registration (*the destination of connection is selected based on the user determining the priority order, i.e., manual registration*); selecting a second priority for an automatic registration or re-registration (*or a near-by device is searched at a preset constant interval, the priority order of a device found is raised, i.e., based upon the location of the device or automatic registration*); (Karusawa, paragraphs [0110-0111]).

18. Claim 15 is a corresponding iterating method claim of claims 1-14; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale.

19. Claim 16 is a corresponding method claim of method claim 1; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale.

20. Claims 17-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pepper et al. (US 5,930,700), hereafter referred as Pepper, in view of Karusawa (US 2004/0053573 A1).

21. As to claim 17, Pepper teaches a system and method for automatically screening and directing incoming calls, comprising the steps of:

receiving by a network a call to the registered user (*the network 300 receives a call coming in for a subscriber from a communication device 302*) (Pepper, col. 5, lines 20-22 and col. 6, lines 12-17);

accessing an entry of a database for the registered user (*the system refers to the subscriber's schedule found in the DateBook database in order to determine at what address/phone number, i.e., at what device the subscriber is currently located*) (Pepper, col. 6, lines 33-37);

coupling the expedited call to a communication device of the multiple communication devices (*depending on the subscriber's schedule, the call maybe connected directly to the subscriber at the selected number, i.e., the selected device, or to any other predetermined call delivery address*) (Pepper, col. 6, lines 39-42).

However, Pepper does not explicitly teach selecting by the network a device having a highest priority in the entry of the database.

In a related art, Karusawa teaches a system and method comprising on receipt of an incoming call, a controller determines the device for connection, from among the devices registered in the memory, based on the priority order pre-set by the user (i.e.,

from the highest to the lowest) and establishes the connection with the selected device (Karusawa, paragraphs [0037 and 0041]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Pepper and Karusawa to select a device having a highest priority in the entry of the database since such methods were conventionally employed in the art to allow the system to automatically select a proper one of plural registered communication devices, depending on the prevailing use state, based on the user's intention (*i.e., based on the priority order pre-set by the user*), in order to establish the connection (Karusawa, paragraph [0116]).

22. As to claim 18, Pepper-Karusawa teaches the method of claim 17, further comprising:

for the registered user, determining from the database whether a registration expiration timer has expired; and if so, discarding by the network a corresponding entry in the database (*the daily appointment calendar 908 allows the subscriber to indicate at what call delivery address, i.e., what device, the subscriber may be reached during certain times of the day only, e.g., from 10AM - 11AM*) (Pepper, col. 9, lines 22-25).

23. As to claim 19, Pepper-Karusawa teaches the method of claim 18, further comprising:

determining by the network whether there is more than one communication device of the registered user having the highest priority; and if there is not, sending by the

network the call to the communication device having the highest priority (establishing the connection with one of the communications devices which ranks first in the priority order, i.e., the device with the highest priority) (Karusawa, paragraphs [0085 and 0092]).

24. As to claim 20, Pepper-Karusawa teaches the method of claim 19, further comprising sending the call to the communication device having the most recent registration time (Karusawa teaches it is possible to automatically select the device for connection, from among the devices registered in the memory, depending on the prevailing user state and based on the user's intention (i.e., hence, it could be obviously implemented to select the communication device having the most recent registration time for connection) (Karusawa, paragraph [0116]).

25. As to claim 21, Pepper-Karusawa teaches a database having multiple registered devices for a user comprising an entry in a database (as illustrated in Fig. 3 of Karusawa) for a type of communication device corresponding to the user including:

a first field for indicating an identification corresponding to the type of communication device (e.g., device A, B and C as illustrated in Fig. 3 of Karusawa); and

an internet protocol (IP) address field corresponding to the type of the communication device (since devices A, B and C maybe a PC, PDA, telephone, fax device, or wireless communication device, inherently, they must have corresponding addresses such as telephone/fax number, network (IP) address in order to establish the call/connection) (the telephone number in Fig. 9 of Pepper).

26. As to claim 22, Pepper-Karusawa teaches the database entry of claim 21 wherein there is further included a priority field for the type of the communication device *(as illustrated in Fig. 3 of Karusawa)*.

27. As to claim 23, Pepper-Karusawa teaches the database entry of claim 22 wherein further included a registration time field for the type of the communication device *(for example, from 10AM – 11AM as illustrated in Fig. 9 of Pepper)*.

28. As to claim 24, Pepper-Karusawa teaches the database entry of claim 23 wherein further included an expiration registration time field for the type of the communication device *(expiration registration time for device 829-4544 is 11AM as illustrated in Fig. 9 of Pepper)*.

29. As to claim 25, Pepper-Karusawa teaches the database entry of claim 24 wherein further included a plurality of entries in the database corresponding to a plurality of types of communication devices for the user *(Fig. 3 of Karusawa and Fig. 9 of Karusawa)*.


30. Further references of interest are cited on Form PTO-892, which is an attachment to this office action.

31. A shortened statutory period for reply to this action is set to expire THREE (3) months from the mailing date of this communication. See 37 CFR 1.134.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quang N. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3886.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's SPE, Rupal Dharia, can be reached at (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER